arXiv:1401.0557v3 [math-ph] 4 Dec 2014

The statistical dynamics of a spatial logistic model and the related kinetic equation

Dmitri Finkelshtein[1] Yuri Kondratiev[2] Yuri Kozitsky[3]
Oleksandr Kutoviy[4]

December 8, 2014

Abstract

There is studied an infinite system of point entities in $\mathbb{R}^d$ which reproduce themselves and die, also due to competition. The system's states are probability measures on the space of configurations of entities. Their evolution is described by means of a BBGKY-type equation for the corresponding correlation (moment) functions. It is proved that: (a) these functions evolve on a bounded time interval and remain sub-Poissonian due to the competition; (b) in the Vlasov scaling limit they converge to the correlation functions of the time-dependent Poisson point field the density of which solves the kinetic equation obtained in the scaling limit from the equation for the correlation functions. A number of properties of the solutions of the kinetic equation are also established.

Keywords: Individual-based model; birth-and-death process; random point field; Ovcyannikov's method.

AMS Subject Classification: 82C22, 92D25, 60J80.

1 The Setup

1.1 Introduction

In life sciences, one often deals with large systems of interacting entities distributed over a continuous habitat and evolving in time, cf. [1, 20]. Their collective behavior is observed at a macro-scale, and thus the mathematical theories

[1]Department of Mathematics, Swansea University, Singleton Park, Swansea SA2 8PP, U.K. (d.l.finkelshtein@swansea.ac.uk).

[2]Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Bielefeld, Postfach 110 131, 33501 Bielefeld, Germany (kondrat@math.uni-bielefeld.de).

[3]Instytut Matematyki, Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodwskiej, 30-031 Lublin, Poland (jkozi@hektor.umcs.lublin.pl).

[4]Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Avenue E18-420, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA (kutovyi@mit.edu); Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Bielefeld, Postfach 110 131, 33501 Bielefeld, Germany (kutoviy@math.uni-bielefeld.de).

traditionally describe this behavior by means of phenomenologically deduced nonlinear equations involving macroscopic characteristics like density, mobility, etc, see, e.g., [28]. However, this kind of macroscopic phenomenology may often be insufficient as it does not take into account individual behavior of the constituting entities. Thus, mathematical models and methods are needed for drawing population-level conclusions from individual-level descriptions. The present paper is aimed at contributing to the development of the theory of this kind. We continue studying the model introduced and discussed in [4–6, 10, 13, 15, 19]. This model describes a population of entities (e.g., perennial plants) distributed over $\mathbb{R}^d$, which reproduce themselves and die, also due to competition. As was suggested already in [4], see also page 1311 in [20], the mathematical context proper for studying such objects is provided by the theory of random point fields on $\mathbb{R}^d$. In this setting, populations are modeled as point configurations constituting the set

$$\Gamma := \{\gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^d : |\gamma \cap K| < \infty \text{ for any compact } K \subset \mathbb{R}^d \}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $|A|$ stands for the number of elements in A. This will be the phase space of our model. Along with finite configurations it contains also infinite ones, which allows for studying 'bulk' properties ignoring boundary and size effects.

In the Hamiltonian mechanics, the motion of N physical particles in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is described by a system of $2dN$ differential equations. For $N \gg 1$ (Avogadro's number is $\simeq 6 \times 10^{23}$), the point-wise description gets meaningless since no observation could indicate at which point of the phase space the system actually is. Moreover, the description in terms of individual trajectories would be 'too detailed' to yield understanding the collective behavior of the system. It was realized already in the time of A. Einstein and M. Smoluchowski that the statistical approach in the theory of such systems can link to each other their micro- and macroscopic descriptions. In this approach, one deals with the probabilities with which points of the phase space lie in its subsets. The corresponding probability measures are then considered as the states of the system. However, for interacting particles, the direct study of the evolution of such states encounters serious technical difficulties. In [3], N. N. Bogoliubov suggested to do this by means of the so-called correlation (moment) functions. Their evolution is obtained from an infinite system of equations [7], called now BBGKY hierarchy or chain, that links to each other correlation functions of different order. Starting from the late 1990'th, a similar statistical approach is being implemented in the dynamics of states on Γ, see [11] and the references therein. Gradually, it has become clear also for theoretical biologists [22] that the theory developed in this framework can provide effective methods for studying individual-based models of large systems of living entities.

In this work, the evolution of states $\mu_0 \mapsto \mu_t$ on Γ is described by the Fokker-Planck equation[1]

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mu_t = L^*\mu_t, \qquad \mu_t|_{t=0} = \mu_0, \qquad t > 0, \tag{1.2}$$

[1]For further details on the dynamics of states on Γ see [2, 9–14].

in which 'operator' L^* specifies the model. One can also study the evolution of *observables* – real valued functions on Γ, by means of the Kolmogorov equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}F_t = LF_t, \qquad F_t|_{t=0} = F_0, \qquad t > 0. \tag{1.3}$$

'Operators' L and L^* are related to each other in such a way that the solutions of (1.2) and (1.3) satisfy

$$\int_\Gamma F_0 d\mu_t = \int_\Gamma F_t d\mu_0, \qquad t > 0.$$

For the model studied in this work, L has the form

$$\begin{aligned}(LF)(\gamma) \quad &= \quad \sum_{x\in\gamma} \left[m + E^-(x, \gamma \setminus x)\right] \left[F(\gamma \setminus x) - F(\gamma)\right] \\ &\qquad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} E^+(y, \gamma) \left[F(\gamma \cup y) - F(\gamma)\right] dy,\end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

where

$$E^\pm(x, \gamma) := \sum_{y\in\gamma} a^\pm(x - y) \geq 0. \tag{1.5}$$

The first term in (1.4) describes the death of the particle located at x, occurring independently with rate $m \geq 0$ (intrinsic mortality) and under the influence of the other particles in γ (competition) with rate $E^-(x, \gamma \setminus x)$. Here and in the sequel, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is also treated as a single-point configuration. The second term in (1.4) describes the birth of a particle at $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ given by the whole configuration γ with rate $E^+(y, \gamma)$.

1.2 Correlation functions

As mentioned above, we shall construct the dynamics of the model by employing *correlation functions*, which fully characterize the corresponding states. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a probability measure μ, the n-th order correlation function $k_\mu^{(n)}$ is related to μ by the following formula

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Gamma \left(\sum_{\{x_1,\dots,x_n\}\subset\gamma} G^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \right) \mu(d\gamma) \\ &\qquad = \frac{1}{n!} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^n} G^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) k_\mu^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_1 \cdots dx_n,\end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

which has to hold for all appropriate functions $G^{(n)} : (\mathbb{R}^d)^n \to \mathbb{R}$, symmetric with respect to the interchanges of its variables. Thus, each $k_\mu^{(n)} : (\mathbb{R}^d)^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a symmetric function with a number of specific properties, see, e.g., [11–14].

If one puts also $k_\mu^{(0)} \equiv 1$, then the collection of $k_\mu^{(n)}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, determines a map, $k_\mu : \Gamma_0 \to \mathbb{R}$, defined on the set of finite configurations

$$\Gamma_0 = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \Gamma^{(n)}, \tag{1.7}$$

which is the disjoint union of the sets of n-particle configurations:

$$\Gamma^{(0)} = \{\emptyset\}, \qquad \Gamma^{(n)} = \{\eta \in \Gamma : |\eta| = n\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{1.8}$$

Each $\Gamma^{(n)}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, can be equipped with the topology related to the Euclidean topology of $\mathbb{R}^d$. The restriction of k_μ to a given $\Gamma^{(n)}$, extended to a symmetric function on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^n$, is exactly the n-th order correlation function as in (1.6). In particular, $k_\mu^{(1)}$ is the density of the particles in state μ. The correlation function k_{π_ϱ} of the inhomogeneous Poisson measure π_ϱ is

$$k_{\pi_\varrho}(\eta) = \prod_{x \in \eta} \varrho(x), \tag{1.9}$$

or, equivalently, $k_{\pi_\varrho}^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \varrho(x_1) \cdots \varrho(x_n)$, where the density ϱ is supposed to be locally integrable. A measure μ on $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma)$ is said to be *sub-Poissonian* if its correlation function is such that, for for some $C > 0$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$k_\mu^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq C^n, \qquad \text{for Lebesgue} - \text{a.a. } (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^n. \tag{1.10}$$

In a way, a sub-Poissonian state is similar to the Poissonian state in which the particles are independently placed in $\mathbb{R}^d$. At the same time, the increase of $k_\mu^{(n)}$ as $n!$, see (1.16) below, corresponds to the appearance of *clusters* in state μ.

By an appropriate procedure, [14] the Cauchy problem in (1.3) is transformed into the following one

$$\frac{d}{dt} k_t = L^\Delta k_t, \qquad k_t|_{t=0} = k_0, \tag{1.11}$$

where 'operator'

$$\begin{aligned}(L^\Delta k)(\eta) = &- \left[\sum_{x \in \eta} (m + E^-(x, \eta \setminus x))\right] k(\eta) + \sum_{x \in \eta} E^+(x, \eta \setminus x) k(\eta \setminus x) \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{y \in \eta} a^+(x - y) k((\eta \setminus y) \cup x) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} E^-(x, \eta) k(\eta \cup x) dx\end{aligned} \tag{1.12}$$

is calculated from that in (1.4), and k_0 is the correlation function of μ_0. In contrast to those in (1.4) and (1.5), the sums in (1.12) are finite – the advantage of passing to (1.11). In terms of the 'components' $k_t^{(n)}$, the equation in (1.11) is an infinite chain of linked linear equations, analogous to the BBGKY hierarchy

mentioned above. The first equations in (1.12) are: $dk_t^{(0)}/dt = 0$, and

$$\frac{d}{dt}k_t^{(1)}(x) = -mk_t^{(1)}(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a^-(x-y)k_t^{(2)}(x,y)dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a^+(x-y)k_t^{(1)}(y)dy. \tag{1.13}$$

The equation with $dk_t^{(2)}/dt$ contains $k_t^{(n)}$ with $n = 1, 2, 3$, etc. Theoretical biologists 'solve' such chains by decoupling; cf. [19]. In the simplest version, one sets

$$k_t^{(2)}(x,y) \simeq k_t^{(1)}(x)k_t^{(1)}(y), \tag{1.14}$$

which amounts to neglecting spatial pair correlations (so called *mean field* approximation). Thereafter, (1.13) turns into the following nonlinear (closed) equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}k_t^{(1)}(x) = -mk^{(1)}(x) - k_t^{(1)}(x)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a^-(x-y)k_t^{(1)}(y)dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a^+(x-y)k_t^{(1)}(y)dy, \tag{1.15}$$

which is the kinetic equation for our model, see Section 4 below. Note that the question of whether the evolving states remain sub-Poissonian, and hence clusters do not appear, can be answered only by studying the whole chain $k_\mu^{(n)}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, cf. (1.10). For the contact model – a particular case of the model we study corresponding to $a^- \equiv 0$ in (1.4) and (1.12), it is known [13] that

$$\text{const} \cdot n! c_t^n \leq k_t^{(n)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \leq \text{const} \cdot n! C_t^n, \tag{1.16}$$

where the left-hand inequality holds if x_i belong to a ball of small enough radius.

1.3 Mesoscopic description

Along with the microscopic theory based on (1.3) and (1.11), we provide in this work the mesoscopic description of the evolution obtained from (1.11) by means of the Vlasov scaling, see [10,12], and also Section 6 in [7] and [25] where the general aspects of the scaling of interacting particle systems are discussed. In the 'physical language', the Vlasov scaling can be outlined as follows. One considers the system at the scale where the particle density is large, and hence the interaction should be respectively small in order that the total interaction energy take intermediate values. In the scaling limit, the corpuscular structure disappears and the system turns into a medium described solely by the density, cf. (1.9), whereas the interactions are taken into account in a 'mean-field-like' way. In this limit, the ansatz in (1.14) becomes exact and thus the evolution of the density is obtained from (1.15). An important issue here is to control this passage in a mathematically rigorous way, which includes the convergence of the 'rescaled' correlation functions.

In this work, like also in [2,10,12], the scale is described by a single parameter, $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, tending to zero in the scaling limit and taking value $\varepsilon = 1$ for the initial system described by (1.11). In order to get high densities for small ε, we assume that the correlation function $k_{0,\varepsilon}$ for small ε behaves like $k_{0,\varepsilon}(\eta) \sim \varepsilon^{-|\eta|}$, $\eta \in \Gamma_0$, and thus the rescaled correlation function $r_{0,\varepsilon}(\eta) = \varepsilon^{|\eta|} k_{0,\varepsilon}(\eta)$, or equivalently

$$r^{(n)}_{0,\varepsilon}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \varepsilon^n k^{(n)}_{0,\varepsilon}(x_1, \dots, x_n), \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{1.17}$$

converges as $\varepsilon \to 0$ to the correlation function of a certain state. Namely, we assume that $r^{(n)}_{0,\varepsilon} \to r^{(n)}_0$ in $L^\infty((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Next, we rescale the interaction in (1.12) by multiplying a^- by ε, which yields L^Δ_ε from L^Δ given in (1.12). This means that the evolution $k_{0,\varepsilon} \mapsto k_{t,\varepsilon}$ of the 'dense' system is now governed by (1.11) with L^Δ_ε in the right-hand side. We expect that the evolving system remains 'dense', and thus introduce the rescaled correlation functions

$$r^{(n)}_{t,\varepsilon}(x, \dots, x_n) = \varepsilon^n k^{(n)}_{t,\varepsilon}(x, \dots, x_n), \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{1.18}$$

that solve the following Cauchy problem

$$\frac{d}{dt} r_{t,\varepsilon} = L^\Delta_{\varepsilon,\mathrm{ren}} r_{t,\varepsilon}, \qquad r_{t,\varepsilon}|_{t=0} = r_0, \tag{1.19}$$

which one derives from (1.11) by means of (1.17) and (1.18). 'Operator'

$$L^\Delta_{\varepsilon,\mathrm{ren}} = R_\varepsilon L^\Delta_\varepsilon R_{\varepsilon^{-1}}, \qquad (R_{\varepsilon^{\pm 1}} k)(\eta) = \varepsilon^{\pm|\eta|} k(\eta) \tag{1.20}$$

has the following structure

$$L^\Delta_{\varepsilon,\mathrm{ren}} = V + \varepsilon C, \tag{1.21}$$

where V and C are given in (2.8) below. Along with (1.19), it is natural to consider the Cauchy problem

$$\frac{d}{dt} r_t = V r_t, \qquad r_t|_{t=0} = r_0, \tag{1.22}$$

where r_0 is the same as in (1.19), and to expect that the solution of (1.19) converges to that of (1.22) as $\varepsilon \to 0$. This would give interpolation between the cases of $\varepsilon = 1$ and $\varepsilon = 0$, i.e., between (1.11) and (1.22). The main peculiarity of (1.22) is that the evolution $r_0 \mapsto r_t$ obtained therefrom 'preserves chaos'. That is, if r_0 is the correlation function of the Poisson measure π_{ϱ_0}, see (1.9), then, for all $t > 0$ for which one can solve (1.22), the product form of (1.9) is preserved, i.e., the solution is the product of the values of the density ϱ_t which solves the *kinetic equation*, cf. (1.15),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\varrho_t(x) &= -m\varrho_t(x) - \varrho_t(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a^-(x-y)\varrho_t(y)dy \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a^+(x-y)\varrho_t(y)dy, \qquad \varrho_t|_{t=0} = \varrho_0, \end{aligned} \tag{1.23}$$

1.4 The aims of the paper

For the model specified in (1.4) we aim at:

- proving that due to the competition the Cauchy problems in (1.19) and in (1.22) have sub-Poissonian solutions on the same time interval $[0, T_*)$ (done in Theorems 3.3 and 3.4);
- proving that the solution of (1.22) has the product form of (1.9) with ϱ_t which solves (1.23) (done in Lemma 4.1);
- proving that the solutions of (1.19) converge to that of (1.22), i.e., $r_{t,\varepsilon} \to r_t$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ (done in Theorem 3.5);
- proving solvability and studying the solutions of the kinetic equation (1.23) (done in Theorems 4.2 – 4.6).

In realizing this program, we partly follow the scheme developed in [2, 9], based on Ovcyannikov's method, [27] by means of which the solutions are constructed in scales of Banach spaces. However, here we consider essentially different model where this method cannot be applied directly. Instead, we elaborated an original technique based on the use of 'sun-dual' semigroups acting in scales of Banach spaces perturbed by operators treatable by Ovcyannikov's method, see subsections 3.2 and 3.3 below, and especially Remark 3.10. Further comparison of our results and those obtained for the same model in [10, 13] are given in subsection 4.3.

2 The Mathematical Framework and the Model

For more details on the mathematics used in this paper, see [2, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17].

By $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\rm b}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we denote the set of all Borel and all bounded Borel subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$, respectively. The configuration space (1.1) is endowed with the vague topology – the weakest topology that makes all the maps

$$\Gamma \ni \gamma \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x)\gamma(dx) = \sum_{x\in\gamma} f(x), \quad f \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

continuous. Here $C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ stands for the set of all compactly supported continuous functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$. The vague topology is metrizable in the way that makes Γ a complete and separable metric (Polish) space. By $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma)$ we denote the corresponding Borel σ-algebra.

The set $\Gamma_0 \subset \Gamma$, see (1.7) and (1.8), is endowed with the topology of the disjoint union of the sets $\Gamma^{(n)}$, each of which is endowed with the topology related to the Euclidean topology of $\mathbb{R}^d$. By $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma_0)$ we denote the corresponding Borel σ-algebra. The vague topology of Γ induces on Γ_0 another topology, different from that just mentioned. However, see Lemma 1.1 and Proposition 1.3 in [21], the corresponding Borel σ-algebras coincide, and hence $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma_0) = \{A \in \mathcal{B}(\Gamma) : A \subset \Gamma_0\}$. Therefore, a probability measure μ on $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma)$ such that $\mu(\Gamma_0) = 1$ can

be redefined as a measure on $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma_0)$. Moreover, a function $G : \Gamma_0 \subset \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma)/\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable if and only if its restrictions to each $\Gamma^{(n)}$, more precisely, the functions $G^{(n)} : (\mathbb{R}^d)^n \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$G^{(0)} = G(\emptyset) \in \mathbb{R}, \quad G^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = G(\gamma) \quad \text{for} \ \ \gamma = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

are symmetric and Borel. By the expression

$$\int_{\Gamma_0} G(\eta)\lambda(d\eta) = G^{(0)} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^n} G^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_1 \cdots dx_n,$$

which has to hold for all compactly supported continuous functions $G^{(n)}$, we define a σ-finite measure λ on $\mathcal{B}(\Gamma_0)$, called the *Lebesgue- Poisson* measure. By (1.6) we then get

$$\int_{\Gamma} \left(\sum_{\eta \Subset \gamma} G(\eta) \right) \mu(d\gamma) = \langle\langle G, k_\mu \rangle\rangle := \int_{\Gamma_0} G(\eta) k_\mu(\eta) \lambda(d\eta) \tag{2.1}$$

$$= G^{(0)} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^n} G^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) k_\mu^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_1 \cdots dx_n,$$

where the first sum runs over all finite subsets of γ. By Lemma 2.1 in [11] we also have the following useful property

$$\int_{\Gamma_0} \sum_{\xi \subset \eta} H(\xi, \eta \setminus \xi, \eta) \lambda(d\eta) = \int_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\Gamma_0} H(\xi, \eta, \eta \cup \xi) \lambda(d\xi) \lambda(d\eta). \tag{2.2}$$

Regarding the kernels in (1.5) we suppose that

$$a^{\pm} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \qquad a^{\pm}(x) = a^{\pm}(-x) \geq 0. \tag{2.3}$$

Then we set

$$\langle a^{\pm} \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a^{\pm}(x) dx, \qquad \|a^{\pm}\| = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} a^{\pm}(x), \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$E^{\pm}(\eta) = \sum_{x \in \eta} E^{\pm}(x, \eta \setminus x) = \sum_{x \in \eta} \sum_{y \in \eta \setminus x} a^{\pm}(x - y). \tag{2.5}$$

By (2.3), we then have

$$E^{\pm}(\eta) \leq \|a^{\pm}\| |\eta|^2. \tag{2.6}$$

'Operator' $L^{\Delta}_{\varepsilon,\mathrm{ren}}$ in (1.19) and (1.20) has the following structure, cf. (1.21),

$$L^{\Delta}_{\varepsilon,\mathrm{ren}} = A_0 + B + \varepsilon C = V + \varepsilon C \tag{2.7}$$

where

$$(A_0k)(\eta) = -m|\eta|k(\eta), \tag{2.8}$$

$$(Bk)(\eta) = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} E^-(y,\eta)k(\eta \cup y)dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\sum_{x\in\eta} a^+(x-y)k(\eta \setminus x \cup y)dy,$$

$$(Ck)(\eta) = -E^-(\eta)k(\eta) + \sum_{x\in\eta} E^+(x,\eta\setminus x)k(\eta\setminus x).$$

Note that $L^{\Delta}_{1,\mathrm{ren}}$ is exactly L^{Δ} given in (1.12).

3 The Evolution of Correlation Functions

3.1 The statements

If the competition is absent, the correlation functions are bounded from below by $n!$, see (1.16), and hence clusters appear in the corresponding state. A principal questions regarding the considered model is whether the competition can prevent from such clustering. In view of (1.10), the answer will be affirmative if

$$\|k^{(n)}\|_{L^\infty((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)} \le C^n, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

for some $C > 0$. Then, as in eqs. (3.8) - (3.10) of [2], we introduce the Banach spaces of sub-Poissonian correlation functions in which we solve (1.19) and (1.22) as follows. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$\|k\|_\alpha = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} e^{n\alpha}\|k^{(n)}\|_{L^\infty((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)}, \tag{3.1}$$

that can also be rewritten in the form

$$\|k\|_\alpha = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\eta\in\Gamma_0} |k(\eta)|\exp(\alpha|\eta|). \tag{3.2}$$

Thereafter, we define

$$\mathcal{K}_\alpha = \{k : \Gamma_0 \to \mathbb{R} : \|k\|_\alpha < \infty\}, \tag{3.3}$$

which is a Banach space. In fact, we need the scale of such spaces $\{\mathcal{K}_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$. For $\alpha'' < \alpha'$, we have that $\|k\|_{\alpha''} \le \|k\|_{\alpha'}$; and hence,

$$\mathcal{K}_{\alpha'} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\alpha''}, \qquad \text{for } \alpha'' < \alpha'. \tag{3.4}$$

Our next aim is to define $L^{\Delta}_{\varepsilon,\mathrm{ren}}$, written in (2.7) and (2.8), as a linear operator in $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ for a given $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Put

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha(A_0) = \{k \in \mathcal{K}_\alpha : A_0k \in \mathcal{K}_\alpha\}. \tag{3.5}$$

The sets $\mathcal{D}_\alpha(B)$ and $\mathcal{D}_\alpha(C)$ are defined analogously. Then

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha(L^\Delta_{\varepsilon,\mathrm{ren}}) := \mathcal{D}_\alpha(A_0) \cap \mathcal{D}_\alpha(B) \cap \mathcal{D}_\alpha(C) \tag{3.6}$$

is the domain of $L^\Delta_{\varepsilon,\mathrm{ren}}$ in $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$. Note that $\mathcal{D}_\alpha(L^\Delta_{\varepsilon,\mathrm{ren}})$ is the same for all $\varepsilon > 0$, and

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha(L^\Delta_{0,\mathrm{ren}}) = \mathcal{D}_\alpha(V) = \mathcal{D}_\alpha(A_0) \cap \mathcal{D}_\alpha(B) \supset \mathcal{D}_\alpha(L^\Delta_{\varepsilon,\mathrm{ren}}), \quad \varepsilon \in (0,1]. \tag{3.7}$$

Let us show that

$$\forall \alpha' > \alpha \qquad \mathcal{K}_{\alpha'} \subset \mathcal{D}_\alpha(L^\Delta_{\varepsilon,\mathrm{ren}}). \tag{3.8}$$

By (3.2), we have

$$|k(\eta)| \le \|k\|_{\alpha'} \exp(-\alpha'|\eta|), \qquad \eta \in \Gamma_0.$$

Applying this in (2.8), by (2.4) and (2.6) we then get

$$|(Ck)(\eta)| \le |\eta|^2 \exp(-(\alpha' - \alpha)|\eta|) \left[\|a^-\| + \|a^+\| e^{\alpha'}\right] \|k\|_{\alpha'} \exp(-\alpha|\eta|), \tag{3.9}$$

and also

$$\begin{aligned} |(Bk)(\eta)| &\le \|k\|_{\alpha'} \exp(-\alpha'|\eta| - \alpha') \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} E^-(y,\eta)dy \\ &+ \|k\|_{\alpha'} \exp(-\alpha'|\eta|) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{x\in\eta} a^+(x-y)dy \\ &\le |\eta| \exp(-(\alpha' - \alpha)|\eta|) \left[\langle a^-\rangle e^{-\alpha'} + \langle a^+\rangle\right] \|k\|_{\alpha'} \exp(-\alpha|\eta|). \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

In a similar way, one estimates $|(A_0k)(\eta)|$. These three estimates readily yield (3.8).

Definition 3.1. By a classical solution of the problem (1.19), in the space $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ and on the time interval $[0,T)$, we understand a map $[0,T) \ni t \mapsto r_{t,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha(L^\Delta_{\varepsilon,\mathrm{ren}})$, cf. (3.6), continuously differentiable on $[0,T)$, such that (1.19) is satisfied for $t \in [0,T)$. A classical solution of (1.22), cf. (3.7), is defined in the same way.

Remark 3.2. In view of (3.8), we have that $r_{t,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha(L^\Delta_{\varepsilon,\mathrm{ren}})$ whenever $r_{t,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{K}_{\alpha_t}$ for some $\alpha_t > \alpha$.

The main assumption under which we are going to solve (1.19) is the following: there exists $\theta > 0$ such that

$$a^+(x) \le \theta a^-(x), \qquad \text{for a.a. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.11}$$

Fix $\alpha^* \in \mathbb{R}$ and set, cf. (2.4),

$$T(\alpha) = \frac{\alpha^* - \alpha}{\langle a^+\rangle + \langle a^-\rangle e^{-\alpha}}, \qquad \alpha < \alpha^*. \tag{3.12}$$

Theorem 3.3. *Let (3.11) be satisfied, and let $\alpha^* \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that*

$$e^{\alpha^*}\theta < 1. \tag{3.13}$$

Then, for each $\alpha < \alpha^*$, the problem in (1.19) with $r_0 \in \mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}$ has a unique classical solution in $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ on $[0, T(\alpha))$.

Theorem 3.4. *For each $\alpha^* \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha < \alpha^*$, the problem in (1.22) with $r_0 \in \mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}$ has a unique classical solution in $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ on $[0, T(\alpha))$.*

Theorem 3.5. *Let the assumptions of Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 be satisfied, and $r_{t,\varepsilon}$ and r_t be the solution of (1.19) and (1.22), respectively. Then, for each $\alpha < \alpha^*$ and $t \in (0, T(\alpha))$, it follows that*

$$\sup_{s\in[0,t]} \|r_{s,\varepsilon} - r_s\|_\alpha \to 0, \qquad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{3.14}$$

Let us now make some comments on these statements. The condition in (3.11) can certainly be satisfied if the dispersal kernel decays faster than the competition kernel. The magnitude parameter θ determines the large n asymptotics of the initial correlation function, see (3.1) and (3.13). Note that in Theorem 3.4 we do not require (3.11). The main characteristic feature of the solutions mentioned in Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 is that, at a given t, they lie in a space, $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$, 'bigger' than the initial r_0 does, cf. (3.4). The bigger t, the bigger should be the space $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$. The function $(-\infty, \alpha^*) \ni \alpha \mapsto T(\alpha)$ defined in (3.12) is bounded from above by a certain $T^*(\langle a^+\rangle, \langle a^-\rangle, \alpha^*)$ beyond which the solutions of both problems could not be extended, see, however, Remark 4.4 below.

3.2 The proof of the statements

The proof is based on three lemmas formulated below.

Lemma 3.6. *Let θ be as in (3.11) and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $e^\alpha\theta < 1$, cf. (3.13). Then, for arbitrary $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, there exists a closed subspace, $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \subset \mathcal{K}_\alpha$, and a C_0-semigroup of linear contractions, $S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t) : \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \to \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$, $t \geq 0$, with generator $A_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$, such that, for each $\alpha' > \alpha$, cf. (3.4), the following holds:*

- *(a) $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha'} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(A_{\alpha,\varepsilon}) \subset \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$;*
- *(b) for each $k \in \mathcal{K}_{\alpha'}$, $A_{\alpha,\varepsilon}k = (A_0 + \varepsilon C)k$, where the latter two operators are defined in (2.8) and (3.5), (3.6);*
- *(c) for each $\alpha'' < \alpha$, cf. (3.4), the restriction of $S_{\alpha'',\varepsilon}$ to $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$ coincides with $S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$.*

Lemma 3.7. *For $\varepsilon = 0$, all the statements of Lemma 3.6 hold true without any restrictions on α. Furthermore, for each $\alpha' > \alpha$, $\alpha'' \leq \alpha$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, and any $t > 0$, it follows that*

$$\sup_{s\in[0,t]} \|(S_{\alpha'',\varepsilon}(s) - S_{\alpha'',0}(s))\|_{\alpha'\alpha} \leq \varepsilon t M(\alpha' - \alpha), \tag{3.15}$$

with $M(\varkappa)$ given by the formula

$$M(\varkappa) := \left(\frac{2}{e\varkappa}\right)^2 \left(\|a^-\| + \|a^+\| e^{\alpha^*}\right). \tag{3.16}$$

Corollary 3.8. *For each $\alpha' > \alpha$, $\varepsilon \in [0,1]$, and any $k \in \mathcal{K}_{\alpha'}$, the map*

$$[0, +\infty) \ni t \mapsto S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t)k \in \mathcal{K}_\alpha$$

is continuous.

Remark 3.9. By claim (c) of Lemma 3.6, for $\alpha' > \alpha$ and $\alpha'' \leq \alpha$, each $S_{\alpha'',\varepsilon}(t)$ can be considered as a bounded linear contraction from $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha'}$ to $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. For $\alpha' > \alpha$ and a bounded linear operator $Q : \mathcal{K}_{\alpha'} \to \mathcal{K}_\alpha$, cf. (3.4), by $\|Q\|_{\alpha'\alpha}$ we denote the corresponding operator norm. For $\varkappa > 0$ and $\eta \in \Gamma_0$, we have

$$|\eta| e^{-\varkappa|\eta|} \leq \frac{1}{e\varkappa}, \qquad |\eta|^2 e^{-\varkappa|\eta|} \leq \left(\frac{2}{e\varkappa}\right)^2. \tag{3.17}$$

Let us now fix some $\alpha_* < \alpha^*$ and then set $T_* = T(\alpha_*)$. For $\alpha', \alpha \in [\alpha_*, \alpha^*]$ such that $\alpha' > \alpha$, the expression for B given in (2.8) can be used to define a bounded linear operator $B : \mathcal{K}_{\alpha'} \to \mathcal{K}_\alpha$. We shall keep the notation B for this operator if it is clear between which spaces it acts. However, additional labels will be used if we deal with more than one such B acting between different spaces. The norm of $B : \mathcal{K}_{\alpha'} \to \mathcal{K}_\alpha$ can be estimated by means of (3.10) and (3.17) as follows, cf. (3.12),

$$\|B\|_{\alpha'\alpha} \leq \frac{\alpha^* - \alpha_*}{e(\alpha' - \alpha)T_*}. \tag{3.18}$$

In a similar way, we define also bounded operators $A_0, C : \mathcal{K}_{\alpha'} \to \mathcal{K}_\alpha$, for which we get, cf. (2.8), (3.9), (3.16), and (3.17),

$$\|A_0\|_{\alpha'\alpha} \leq \frac{m}{e(\alpha' - \alpha)}, \qquad \|C\|_{\alpha'\alpha} \leq \left(\frac{2}{e(\alpha' - \alpha)}\right)^2 \left(\|a^-\| + \|a^+\| e^{\alpha^*}\right). \tag{3.19}$$

Now we fix $\alpha \in (\alpha_*, \alpha^*)$ and recall that $T(\alpha)$ is defined in (3.12). Then, for $r_0 \in \mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}$ as in (1.19) and $t \in [0, T(\alpha))$, we define: $u_{t,0} = 0$, and, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$u_{t,n} = S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t)r_0 + \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} \int_0^t \int_0^{t_1} \cdots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} U^{(l)}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t, t_1, \ldots, t_l) r_0 \, dt_l \cdots dt_1, \tag{3.20}$$

where $t_0 = t$ and

$$\begin{aligned} U^{(l)}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t, t_1, \ldots, t_l) \quad &:= \quad S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t - t_1) B_1 S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t_1 - t_2) B_2 \\ &\qquad \times \cdots \times S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t_{l-1} - t_l) B_l S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t_l). \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

The latter operator is suppose to act from $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha^*}$ to $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$. In order to define the action of the operators in the product, we fix $q > 1$ such that $qt < T(\alpha)$ and introduce

$$\alpha_{2p} = \alpha_0 - p\epsilon_1 - p\epsilon_2, \quad \alpha_{2p+1} = \alpha_0 - (p+1)\epsilon_1 - p\epsilon_2, \quad p = 0, \dots, l, \tag{3.22}$$

where $\alpha_0 = \alpha^*$, $\alpha_{2l+1} = \alpha$, and

$$\epsilon_1 = \frac{(q-1)(\alpha^* - \alpha)}{q(l+1)}, \qquad \epsilon_2 = \frac{\alpha^* - \alpha}{ql}. \tag{3.23}$$

Then the operators in the product in (3.21) are set to act as follows, cf. Lemma 3.6, (2.8), and (3.18),

$$\begin{aligned} &S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t_l) : \mathcal{K}_{\alpha_0} \to \mathcal{K}_{\alpha_1}, \\ &S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t_{l-p} - t_{l-p+1}) : \mathcal{K}_{\alpha_{2p}} \to \mathcal{K}_{\alpha_{2p+1}}, \\ &B_{l-p+1} : \mathcal{K}_{\alpha_{2p-1}} \to \mathcal{K}_{\alpha_{2p}}, \qquad p = 1, \dots l. \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Since all $S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t)$ are contractions, from (3.20) we have

$$\|u_{t,n+1} - u_{t,n}\|_\alpha \le \frac{t^n}{n!} \|B_1 B_2 \cdots B_n\|_{\alpha^*\alpha} \|r_0\|_{\alpha^*}, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.25}$$

Note that the right-hand side of (3.25) is independent of ε. To estimate it we use (3.18), then (3.23) and the last line in (3.24) with $l = n$, which yields, cf. (3.23),

$$\|B_{n-p+1}\|_{\alpha_{2p-1}\alpha_{2p}} \le \frac{\alpha^* - \alpha}{e\epsilon_2 T(\alpha)} = \frac{qn}{eT(\alpha)}, \qquad p = 1, \dots n. \tag{3.26}$$

Applying this in (3.25) we obtain

$$\sup_{s\in[0,t]} \|u_{s,n+1} - u_{s,n}\|_\alpha \le \frac{1}{n!} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n \left(\frac{qt}{T(\alpha)}\right)^n, \tag{3.27}$$

which means that $\{u_{s,n}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is a Cauchy sequence in each of $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha'}$, $\alpha' \in [\alpha_*, \alpha]$, uniformly in $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$ and in $s \in [0,t]$. Let $u_s \in \mathcal{K}_\alpha$ be its limit. By Corollary 3.8, $U^{(l)}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$ is continuous in $t_1, \dots t_l$, and hence $u_{t,n} \in \mathcal{K}_\alpha$ is continuously differentiable in $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ on $t \in [0, T(\alpha))$. Then, see claim (b) of Lemma 3.6,

$$\frac{d}{dt} u_{t,n} = A_{\alpha,\varepsilon} u_{t,n} + B u_{t,n-1} = (A_0 + \varepsilon C) u_{t,n} + B u_{t,n-1}, \tag{3.28}$$

where both $(A_0 + \varepsilon C)$ and B act from $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ to $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha_*}$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{s\in[0,t]} \|(A_0 + \varepsilon C)(u_{s,n+1} - u_{s,n})\|_{\alpha_*} \\ &\qquad\qquad \le \Big(\|A_0\|_{\alpha\alpha_*} + \|C\|_{\alpha\alpha_*}\Big) \sup_{s\in[0,t]} \|u_{s,n+1} - u_{s,n}\|_\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

$$\sup_{s\in[0,t]}\|B(u_{s,n+1}-u_{s,n})\|_{\alpha_*}\le\|B\|_{\alpha\alpha_*}\sup_{s\in[0,t]}\|u_{s,n+1}-u_{s,n}\|_{\alpha},$$

where the operator norms can be estimated as in (3.19). Hence, by (3.27) $\{du_{s,n}/ds\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha_*}$, uniformly in $s\in[0,t]$. Therefore, the limiting $u_s\in\mathcal{K}_\alpha\subset\mathcal{K}_{\alpha_*}$ is continuously differentiable on $[0,t]$, and

$$du_{s,n}/ds\to du_s/ds,\qquad n\to+\infty.$$

On the other hand, the right-hand side of (3.28) converges in $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha_*}$ to $L^{\Delta}_{\varepsilon,\mathrm{ren}}u_s$, see (2.7). Hence, u_s is the classical solution on $[0,t]$, see Definition 3.1 and Remark 3.2. Since such t can be arbitrary in $(0,T_*)$, this yields the existence of the solution in question.

Let us now prove the uniqueness. In view of the linearity of the problem in (1.19), it is enough to prove that the zero function is its only solution corresponding to the zero initial condition. Let $\alpha\in(\alpha_*,\alpha^*)$ be fixed, and let $t\in(0,T_*)$ be such that $t<T(\alpha)$, see (3.12). Then the problem in (1.19) with the zero initial condition has classical solutions in $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ on $[0,t]$. Each of them solves also the following integral equation, cf. (3.20),

$$u_t=\int_0^t S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t-s)Bu_s ds,\tag{3.29}$$

see the proof of Theorem IX.1.19, page 486 in [16]. Since $t<T(\alpha)$, there exists $\alpha'\in(\alpha_*,\alpha)$ such that also $t<T(\alpha')$. Note that u_t in the left-hand side of (3.29) lies in $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha'}$, cf. (3.4). Then the meaning of (3.29) is the following. As a bounded operator, cf (3.18), B maps $u_s\in\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ to $Bu_s\in\mathcal{K}_{\alpha''}$, $\alpha''\in(\alpha',\alpha)$, continuously in s. Furthermore, in view of claim (c) of Lemma 3.6, $S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$ in (3.29) can be replaced by $S_{\alpha',\varepsilon}$. Then, by Corollary 3.8, the integrand in (3.29) is continuous in s, and hence the integral makes sense. Now we iterate (3.29) n times and get, cf. (3.20) and (3.21),

$$\begin{aligned}u_t &= \int_0^t S_{\alpha',\varepsilon}(t-t_1)B_1\int_0^{t_1}S_{\alpha',\varepsilon}(t_1-t_2)B_2\times\\ &\times\ \cdots\times\int_0^{t_n}S_{\alpha',\varepsilon}(t_{n-1}-t_n)B_nu_{t_n}dt_n\cdots dt_1,\end{aligned}$$

from which we deduce the following estimate, cf (3.25),

$$\|u_t\|_{\alpha'}\le\frac{t^n}{n!}\|B_1B_2\cdots B_n\|_{\alpha\alpha'}\sup_{s\in[0,t]}\|u_s\|_\alpha.\tag{3.30}$$

Recall that $[0,t]\ni s\mapsto u_s\in\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ is continuous. Similarly as in the case of (3.25) we then get

$$\|B_1B_2\cdots B_n\|_{\alpha\alpha'}\le\Big(\frac{n}{e}\Big)^n\left[\frac{\alpha^*-\alpha}{T(\alpha)(\alpha-\alpha')}\right]^n.$$

Hence, by picking large enough n the right-hand side of (3.30) can be made arbitrarily small whenever

$$t < \left(\frac{\alpha - \alpha'}{\alpha^* - \alpha}\right) T(\alpha).$$

This proves that u_t is the zero element of $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha'}$ for small enough $t > 0$. Since u_t lies in $\mathcal{K}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{K}_{\alpha'}$, then u_t is also the zero element of $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$. Now we repeat the above procedure on the interval $[t, 2t]$ and obtain that u_{2t} is also the zero element of $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$. The extension of this fact to each $t < T_*$ then follows. □

Remark 3.10. The proof of the uniqueness has been done in the spirit of Ovcyannikov's method, see pages 16 and 17 in [27]. Here, however, we deal with operators which cannot be directly accommodated to the Ovcyannikov scheme, see the second estimate in (3.19). We have managed to take these operators into account through the 'sun-dual' semigroup mentioned in Lemma 3.6.

Proof of Theorem 3.4. By the same procedure as in the proof of Theorem 3.3 we obtain that the sequence defined recursively, cf. (3.20), by

$$\begin{aligned} v_{t,n} = S_{\alpha_*,0}(t) r_0 \quad &+ \quad \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} \int_0^t \int_0^{t_1} \cdots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} S_{\alpha_*,0}(t - t_1) B_1 \qquad (3.31) \\ &\times \quad S_{\alpha_*,0}(t_1 - t_2) B_2 \cdots S_{\alpha_*,0}(t_{l-1} - t_l) B_l S_{\alpha_*,0}(t_l) r_0 \, dt_l \cdots dt_1, \end{aligned}$$

converges in $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha_*}$ to a classical solution of (1.22). In contrast to the case of $\varepsilon > 0$, the semigroup $S_{\alpha,0}$ can be constructed explicitly: cf. claim (b) of Lemma 3.6,

$$(S_{\alpha,0}(t)v)(\eta) = \exp(-tm|\eta|)v(\eta), \qquad v \in \mathcal{K}_\alpha, \qquad (3.32)$$

which allows for omitting (3.13) in this case. The rest of the proof goes exactly as in Theorem 3.3. □

Proof of Theorem 3.5. Let $r_{t,\varepsilon}$ be the limit of the sequence $\{u_{t,n}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ defined in (3.20). We prove that this $r_{t,\varepsilon}$ converges to r_t, as stated in the theorem. Given $\delta > 0$ and $t \in (0, T_*)$, let $n_\delta \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that, for all $n > n_\delta$, both following estimates hold

$$\sup_{s\in[0,t]} \|u_{s,n} - r_{s,\varepsilon}\|_{\alpha_*} < \delta/3, \qquad \sup_{s\in[0,t]} \|v_{s,n} - r_s\|_{\alpha_*} < \delta/3, \qquad (3.33)$$

where $v_{s,n}$ is defined in (3.31). Note that the first estimate in (3.33) is uniform in $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ as the right-hand side of (3.25) is ε-independent. By (3.20) and (3.31), we get

$$\begin{aligned} u_{s,n} - v_{s,n} \quad &= \quad Q_\varepsilon(s) r_0 \qquad (3.34) \\ &+ \quad \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} \int_0^s \int_0^{s_1} \cdots \int_0^{s_{l-1}} \sum_{p=1}^{l+1} R_\varepsilon^{(p,l)}(s, s_1, \ldots, s_l) r_0 \, ds_l \cdots ds_1, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$Q_\varepsilon(s) := S_{\alpha_*,\varepsilon}(s) - S_{\alpha_*,0}(s),$$

$$R_\varepsilon^{(0,l)}(s,s_1,\dots,s_l) := S_{\alpha_*,\varepsilon}(s-s_1)B_1\cdots S_{\alpha_*,\varepsilon}(s_{l-1}-s_l)B_lQ_\varepsilon(s_l), \tag{3.35}$$

and, for $p = 1,\dots,l$,

$$\begin{aligned} R_\varepsilon^{(p,l)}(s,s_1,\dots,s_l) &:= S_{\alpha_*,\varepsilon}(s-s_1)B_1\cdots S_{\alpha_*,\varepsilon}(s_{l-p-1}-s_{l-p})B_{l-p} \\ &\times Q_\varepsilon(s_{l-p}-s_{l-p+1})B_{l-p+1}S_{\alpha_*,0}(s_{l-p+1}-s_{l-p+2})B_{l-p+1} \\ &\times\cdots\times S_{\alpha_*,0}(s_{l-1}-s_l)B_lS_{\alpha_*,0}(s_l). \end{aligned} \tag{3.36}$$

In (3.36), the operators $S_{\alpha_*,\varepsilon}$ and B_p act as in (3.24). Then taking into account that $\|S_{\alpha_*,\varepsilon}(s)\|_{\alpha'\alpha} \le 1$, see Lemma 3.6, and likewise $\|S_{\alpha_*,0}(s)\|_{\alpha'\alpha} \le 1$, cf. (3.32), for a fixed $s \in (0,T_*)$ and $q > 1$ such that $qs < T_*$, we obtain from (3.35), (3.36) and from (3.15), (3.16), (3.22), (3.23), (3.24), and (3.26) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_\varepsilon^{(0,l)}(s,s_1,\dots,s_l)\|_{\alpha^*\alpha_*} &\le \varepsilon K(l+1)^2 s_l \|B_1\cdots B_l\|_{\alpha^*\alpha_*} \\ &\le \varepsilon K(l+1)^2 s_l \left(\frac{ql}{eT_*}\right)^l, \end{aligned}$$

and likewise for $p = 1,\dots,l$,

$$\|R_\varepsilon^{(p,l)}(s,s_1,\dots,s_l)\|_{\alpha^*\alpha_*} \le \varepsilon K(l+1)^2 (s_{l-p}-s_{l-p+1}) \left(\frac{ql}{eT_*}\right)^l,$$

where

$$K := \left[\frac{2q}{e(q-1)(\alpha_*-\alpha_*)}\right]^2.$$

Applying both latter estimates in (3.34) we finally get that, for $t \in [0,T_*)$ and $q > 1$ such that $qt < T_*$, the following holds

$$\sup_{s\in[0,t]} \|u_{s,n} - v_{s,n}\|_{\alpha_*} \le \varepsilon \|r_0\|_{\alpha^*} \varphi_q(t), \tag{3.37}$$

where

$$\varphi_q(t) := tK \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l!} \left(\frac{l}{e}\right)^l (l+1)^2 \left(\frac{qt}{T_*}\right)^l.$$

Now we fix $n > n_\delta$ such that both estimates in (3.33) hold, independently of ε. Next, for this fixed n, we pick ε such that also the left-hand side of (3.37) is less than $\delta/3$, which by the triangle inequality yields (3.14). □

3.3 The proof of Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7

The semigroups in question will be obtained with the help of the corresponding semigroups constructed in the pre-dual spaces.

For a given $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, the space $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ defined in (3.3), (3.2) is dual to the Banach space $\mathcal{G}_\alpha := L^1(\Gamma_0, e^{-\alpha|\cdot|}d\lambda)$, with norm

$$\|G\|_\alpha = \int_{\Gamma_0} |G(\eta)| \exp(-\alpha|\eta|)\lambda(d\eta) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} e^{-n\alpha} \|G^{(n)}\|_{L^1((\mathbb{R}^d)^n)}.$$

The duality is defined by the pairing $\langle\langle G, k \rangle\rangle$ as in (2.1). For $G : \Gamma_0 \to \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$(\widehat{A}_\varepsilon^{(1)} G)(\eta) = -(|\eta|m + \varepsilon E^-(\eta))G(\eta) := -E(\eta)G(\eta), \tag{3.38}$$

$$(\widehat{A}_\varepsilon^{(2)} G)(\eta) = \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} E^+(y, \eta) G(\eta \cup y) dy,$$

and

$$\widehat{A}_\varepsilon = \widehat{A}_\varepsilon^{(1)} + \widehat{A}_\varepsilon^{(2)}. \tag{3.39}$$

For α as in Lemma 3.6, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_\alpha(\widehat{A}_\varepsilon^{(1)}) &= \{G \in \mathcal{G}_\alpha : E(\cdot)G(\cdot) \in \mathcal{G}_\alpha\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_\alpha(\widehat{A}_\varepsilon^{(2)}) &= \{G \in \mathcal{G}_\alpha : E^+(\cdot)G(\cdot) \in \mathcal{G}_\alpha\}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.40}$$

where $E^\pm(\eta)$ are given in (2.5). Now we use (3.38) to define the corresponding operators in $\mathcal{G}_\alpha$. As a multiplication operator, $\widehat{A}_\varepsilon^{(1)} : \mathcal{G}_\alpha \to \mathcal{G}_\alpha$ with $\mathrm{Dom}(\widehat{A}_\varepsilon^{(1)}) = \mathcal{D}_\alpha(\widehat{A}_\varepsilon^{(1)})$ is closed. By (2.2), for $G \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha(\widehat{A}_\varepsilon^{(2)})$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{A}_\varepsilon^{(2)} G\|_\alpha &\leq \varepsilon \int_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} E^+(y, \eta) |G(\eta \cup y)| e^{-\alpha|\eta|} dy \lambda(d\eta) \\ &= e^\alpha \varepsilon \int_{\Gamma_0} |G(\eta)| e^{-\alpha|\eta|} \left(\sum_{x \in \eta} E^+(x, \eta \setminus x) \right) \lambda(d\eta) \\ &= e^\alpha \varepsilon \|E^+(\cdot)G(\cdot)\|_\alpha. \end{aligned} \tag{3.41}$$

Hence, $\widehat{A}_\varepsilon^{(2)} : \mathcal{G}_\alpha \to \mathcal{G}_\alpha$ with $\mathrm{Dom}(\widehat{A}_\varepsilon^{(2)}) = \mathcal{D}_\alpha(\widehat{A}_\varepsilon^{(2)})$ is well-defined.

We say that $G \in \mathcal{G}_\alpha$ is positive if $G(\eta) \geq 0$ for λ-almost all $\eta \in \Gamma_0$. Let $\mathcal{G}_\alpha^+$ be the cone of all positive $G \in \mathcal{G}_\alpha$. An operator $(Q, \mathrm{Dom}Q)$ on $\mathcal{G}_\alpha$ is said to be positive if $Q : \mathrm{Dom}(Q) \cap \mathcal{G}_\alpha^+ \to \mathcal{G}_\alpha^+$. A semigroup of operators $S(t) : \mathcal{G}_\alpha \to \mathcal{G}_\alpha$, $t \geq 0$, is called *sub-stochastic* if each $S(t)$ is positive and $\|S(t)G\|_\alpha \leq \|G\|_\alpha$ for all $G \in \mathcal{G}_\alpha$. The proof of Lemma 3.6 is based on Theorem 2.2 of [26] which we formulate here in the following form.

Proposition 3.11. *Let $(Q_0, \mathrm{Dom}(Q_0))$ be the generator of a C_0-semigroup of positive operators on $\mathcal{G}_\alpha$, and let $Q_1 : \mathrm{Dom}(Q_0) \to \mathcal{G}_\alpha$ be positive and such that, for all $G \in \mathrm{Dom}(Q_0) \cap \mathcal{G}_\alpha^+$,*

$$\int_{\Gamma_0} ((Q_0 + Q_1)G)(\eta) \exp(-\alpha|\eta|)\lambda(d\eta) \leq 0.$$

Then, for all $\varkappa \in (0, 1)$, the operator $(Q_0 + \varkappa Q_1, \mathrm{Dom}(Q_0))$ is the generator of a sub-stochastic semigroup on $\mathcal{G}_\alpha$.

Proof of Lemma 3.6. The operator $\widehat{A}^{(1)}_\varepsilon$ defined in (3.38) and (3.40) generates a positive semigroup on $\mathcal{G}_\alpha$. For a $\varkappa \in (0,1)$, by (2.2) we have, cf. (3.41),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Gamma_0} \Big((\widehat{A}^{(1)}_\varepsilon + \varkappa^{-1}\widehat{A}^{(2)}_\varepsilon) G(\eta) \Big) \exp(-\alpha|\eta|)\lambda(d\eta) \qquad (3.42)\\
&= -m \int_{\Gamma_0} |\eta| G(\eta) \exp(-\alpha|\eta|)\lambda(d\eta) - \varepsilon \int_{\Gamma_0} E^-(\eta) G(\eta) \exp(-\alpha|\eta|)\lambda(d\eta)\\
&+ \frac{\varepsilon}{\varkappa} \int_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} E^+(y,\eta) G(\eta \cup y) \exp(-\alpha|\eta|)\lambda(d\eta)\\
&= -m \int_{\Gamma_0} |\eta| G(\eta) \exp(-\alpha|\eta|)\lambda(d\eta)\\
&-\varepsilon \int_{\Gamma_0} \left[E^-(\eta) - \varkappa^{-1} e^\alpha E^+(\eta) \right] G(\eta) \exp(-\alpha|\eta|)\lambda(d\eta).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $e^\alpha \theta < 1$, we can pick $\varkappa \in (0,1)$ such that also $e^\alpha \theta \varkappa^{-1} < 1$. For this $\varkappa$, by (3.11) we have $\left[E^-(\eta) - \varkappa^{-1} e^\alpha E^+(\eta) \right] \geq 0$ for λ-almost all η, which means that the left-hand side of (3.42) is non-positive for such $\varkappa$. We also have that $\varkappa^{-1}\widehat{A}^{(2)}_\varepsilon$ is positive and defined on the domain of $\widehat{A}^{(1)}_\varepsilon$ by (3.41). Then, by Proposition 3.11, the operator $\widehat{A}_\varepsilon = \widehat{A}^{(1)}_\varepsilon + \varkappa(\varkappa^{-1}\widehat{A}^{(2)}_\varepsilon)$, cf. (3.39), is the generator of a sub-stochastic semigroup on $\mathcal{G}_\alpha$, which we denote by $\widehat{S}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t)$, $t \geq 0$. Note that this in particular means

$$\|\widehat{S}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t) G\|_\alpha \leq \|G\|_\alpha, \qquad t > 0, \quad G \in \mathcal{G}_\alpha. \qquad (3.43)$$

For a fixed $t > 0$, let $\widehat{S}^*_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t)$ be the operator adjoint to $\widehat{S}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t)$. All such operators constitute a semigroup on $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$, which, however is not strongly continuous as the space $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ is of L^∞-type. Let $\widehat{A}^*_\varepsilon$ be the adjoint to $\widehat{A}_\varepsilon$. Its domain is, cf. (2.1),

$$\mathrm{Dom}(\widehat{A}^*_\varepsilon) = \big\{ k \in \mathcal{K}_\alpha : \exists \tilde{k} \in \mathcal{K}_\alpha \ \ \forall G \in \mathrm{Dom}(\widehat{A}_\varepsilon) \ \ \langle\!\langle \widehat{A}_\varepsilon G, k \rangle\!\rangle = \langle\!\langle G, \tilde{k} \rangle\!\rangle \big\}. \qquad (3.44)$$

By $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$ we denote the closure of (3.44) in $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$. From the very definition in (3.44) by (2.2) it follows that

$$\forall \alpha' > \alpha \qquad \mathcal{K}_{\alpha'} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(\widehat{A}^*_\varepsilon) \subset \overline{\mathrm{Dom}(\widehat{A}^*_\varepsilon)} =: \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}, \qquad (3.45)$$

and

$$\forall k \in \mathcal{K}_{\alpha'} \qquad \widehat{A}^*_\varepsilon k = (A_0 + \varepsilon C)k. \qquad (3.46)$$

Note that $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$ is a proper subspace of $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$. Now, for $t > 0$, we set

$$S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t) = \widehat{S}^*_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t) \big|_{\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}} . \qquad (3.47)$$

By Theorem 10.4, page 39 in [23], the collection $\{S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ constitutes a C_0-semigroup on $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$, called sometimes 'sun-dual' to $\{\widehat{S}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$. Its generator $A_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$ is the part of $\widehat{A}^*_\varepsilon$ in $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$, that is, the restriction of $\widehat{A}^*_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$ to the set

$$\mathrm{Dom}(A_{\alpha,\varepsilon}) := \{ k \in \mathrm{Dom}(\widehat{A}^*_\varepsilon) : \widehat{A}^*_\varepsilon k \in \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \}. \qquad (3.48)$$

By (3.9) and (3.10), it can be shown that, for any $\alpha'' \in (\alpha, \alpha')$, both A_0 and C act as bounded operators from $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha'}$ to $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha''}$. Therefore, $(A_0 + \varepsilon C)k \in \mathcal{K}_{\alpha''} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$, and hence

$$\mathcal{K}_{\alpha'} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(A_{\alpha,\varepsilon}). \tag{3.49}$$

Thus, the objects introduced in (3.46), (3.47), and (3.48) have the properties stated in the lemma, cf. (3.45) and (3.49). □

Proof of Lemma 3.7. For $\varepsilon = 0$, we have, cf. (3.38) and (3.39), $\widehat{A}_0 = \widehat{A}_0^{(1)}$, where the latter is the multiplication operator by $|\cdot|$. Hence, the operator, cf. (2.8),

$$(A_{\alpha,0}k)(\eta) = -m|\eta|k(\eta), \quad \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,0} = \mathrm{Dom}(A_{\alpha,0}) := \{k \in \mathcal{K}_\alpha : |\cdot|k \in \mathcal{K}_\alpha\} \tag{3.50}$$

is the generator of the semigroup of $S_{\alpha,0}(t)$, $t \geq 0$, defined by

$$(S_{\alpha,0}(t)k)(\eta) = \exp(-tm|\eta|)k(\eta).$$

Clearly, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,0}. \tag{3.51}$$

Let us show now that (3.15) holds. For $k \in \mathcal{K}_{\alpha'}$, by (3.46) and (3.50), we have

$$(A_{\alpha,\varepsilon} - A_{\alpha,0})k = \varepsilon Ck. \tag{3.52}$$

For such k, we set

$$u_t = (S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t) - S_{\alpha,0}(t))k. \tag{3.53}$$

Then $u_0 = 0$ and, cf. (3.52),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}u_t &= S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t)A_{\alpha,\varepsilon}k - S_{\alpha,0}(t)A_{\alpha,0}k \\ &= \varepsilon S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t)Ck + A_{\alpha,0}u_t. \end{aligned} \tag{3.54}$$

In the latter line, we have taken into account also (3.51). By (3.9), one can define C as a bounded linear operator $C : \mathcal{K}_{\alpha'} \to \mathcal{K}_{\alpha''}$ for $\alpha'' \in (\alpha, \alpha')$. Then $Ck \in \mathrm{Dom}(A_{\alpha,\varepsilon})$, cf. (3.49), and hence

$$[0, +\infty) \ni t \mapsto \varphi_t := S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t)Ck \in \mathcal{K}_\alpha$$

is continuously differentiable in $\mathcal{K}_\alpha$ on $[0, +\infty)$. In view of (3.43),

$$\|S_{\alpha,\varepsilon}(t)\| \leq 1, \qquad \text{for all } \ t \geq 0 \ \text{ and } \ \varepsilon \in [0, 1].$$

Then

$$\|\varphi_t\|_\alpha \leq \|C\|_{\alpha'\alpha}\|k\|_{\alpha'}. \tag{3.55}$$

By Theorem 1.19, page 486 in [16], we have from the second line in (3.54)

$$u_t = \varepsilon \int_0^t S_{\alpha,0}(t - s)\varphi_s ds,$$

which by (3.55) yields

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|u_t\|_\alpha \le \varepsilon T \|C\|_{\alpha'\alpha} \|k\|_{\alpha'}.$$

Then (3.15) and (3.16) follow from the latter estimate by (3.53) and (3.19). □

4 The Kinetic Equation

4.1 Solving the equation

For the model which we consider, the kinetic equation is the following Cauchy problem in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, cf. (1.23),

$$\frac{d}{dt}\varrho_t = -m\varrho_t - (a^- * \varrho_t)\varrho_t + (a^+ * \varrho_t), \qquad \varrho_t|_{t=0} = \varrho_0. \tag{4.1}$$

Here, for an appropriate function $\varrho : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, we write

$$(a^\pm * \varrho)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a^\pm(x-y)\varrho(y)dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varrho(x-y)a^\pm(y)dy, \tag{4.2}$$

where $a^\pm$ are the kernels as in (1.5). The main peculiarity of (4.1) is that the solution of (1.22) can be sought in the form

$$r_t(\eta) = e(\varrho_t, \eta) := \prod_{x\in\eta} \varrho_t(x), \tag{4.3}$$

where $\varrho_t \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a solution of (4.1). Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^+ &= \{\varrho \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) : \varrho(x) \ge 0 \ \text{ for a.a. } x\}, \\ \Delta_b &= \{\varrho \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) : \|\varrho\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \le b\}, \qquad b > 0, \\ \Delta_b^+ &= \Delta^+ \cap \Delta_b. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Lemma 4.1. *Let α^*, $\alpha < \alpha^*$, and $T(\alpha)$ be as in Theorem 3.3. Set $b_0 = \exp(-\alpha^*)$ and $b = \exp(-\alpha)$. Suppose that, for $t \in [0, T(\alpha))$, the problem in (4.1) with $\varrho_0 \in \Delta_{b_0}^+$, has a unique classical solution $\varrho_s \in \Delta_b^+$ on $[0,t]$. Then the unique solution $r_s \in \mathcal{K}_\alpha$ of (1.22) with $r_0(\eta) = e(\varrho_0, \eta)$, see Theorem 3.4, is given by (4.3).*

Proof. First of all we note that, for a given α, $e(\varrho, \cdot) \in \mathcal{K}_\alpha$ if and only if $\varrho \in \Delta_b$ with $b = e^{-\alpha}$, see (3.3) and (3.2). Now set $\tilde{r}_t = e(\varrho_t, \cdot)$ with ϱ_t solving (4.1). This $\tilde{r}_t$ solves (1.22), which can easily be checked by computing d/dt and employing the equation in (4.1). In view of the uniqueness as in Theorem 3.4, we then have $\tilde{r}_s = r_s$ on $[0,t]$, from which it can be continued to $[0, T(\alpha))$ by repeating the same arguments on the interval $[t, 2t]$, etc. □

As (4.3) is the correlation function of the Poisson measure π_{ϱ_t}, the above lemma establishes the so called *chaos preservation* or *chaos propagation* in time as the most chaotic states are those corresponding to Poisson measures. Now let us turn to solving (4.1).

Theorem 4.2. *For arbitrary $\varrho_0 \in \Delta^+$, the problem in (4.1) has a unique classical solution $\varrho_t \in \Delta^+$ on $[0, +\infty)$.*

Proof. For a certain $\epsilon \geq 0$, let us consider

$$u_t(x) = e^{-\epsilon t}\varrho_t(x), \qquad t \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{4.5}$$

Then ϱ_t solves (4.1) if and only if u_t solves the following problem

$$\frac{d}{dt}u_t = -(m+\epsilon)u_t - e^{\epsilon t}(a^- * u_t)u_t + (a^+ * u_t), \quad u_t|_{t=0} = \varrho_0. \tag{4.6}$$

By integrating this differential problem we get the integral equation

$$\begin{aligned} u_t &= \varrho_0 \exp\left(-(m+\epsilon)t - \int_0^t e^{\epsilon\tau}(a^- * u_\tau)d\tau\right) \\ &+ \int_0^t (a^+ * u_\tau)\exp\left(-(m+\epsilon)(t-\tau) - \int_\tau^t e^{\epsilon s}(a^- * u_s)ds\right)d\tau, \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

which we will consider in the Banach space $\mathcal{C}_T$ of all continuous maps $u : [0,T] \to L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with norm

$$\|u\|_T := \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|u_t\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Here $T > 0$ is a fixed parameter, which we choose later together with ϵ. Then (4.7) can be written in the form $u = F(u)$, and hence the solution of (4.7) is a fixed point of the map defined by the right-hand side of this equation. Set $\mathcal{C}_T^+ = \{u \in \mathcal{C}_T : \forall t \in [0,T]\ u_t \in \Delta^+\}$. By (4.7) we have that, for each $u \in \mathcal{C}_T^+$ and for all $t \in [0,T]$, the following holds

$$\|F(u)_t\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \|\varrho_0\|_T \exp[-t(m+\epsilon)] + \|u\|_T \frac{\langle a^+\rangle}{m+\epsilon}\Big(1 - \exp[-t(m+\epsilon)]\Big),$$

where we consider ϱ_0 as a constant map from $[0,T]$ to $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Now we set $\epsilon = 0$ if $\langle a^+\rangle \leq m$, and $\epsilon = \langle a^+\rangle - m$ otherwise. Then $\|F(u)_t\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq b$, and hence $\|F(u)\|_T \leq b$ whenever $\max\{\|\varrho_0\|_T; \|u\|_T\} \leq b$. Therefore, F maps the positive part of a centered at zero ball in $\mathcal{C}_T$ into itself. Let us now show that F is a contraction on such sets whenever T is small enough. By means of the inequality

$$\left|e^{-\alpha} - e^{-\beta}\right| \leq |\alpha - \beta|, \qquad \alpha, \beta \geq 0,$$

for fixed $b > 0$ and $t \in [0, T]$, and for $\varrho_0, u, \tilde{u} \in \mathcal{C}_T^+$ such that $\|\varrho_0\|_T, \|u\|_T, \|\tilde{u}\|_T \leq b$, we obtain from (4.7)

$$\|F(u)_t - F(\tilde{u})_t\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq be^{-(m+\epsilon)t} \int_0^t e^{\epsilon\tau} \|U_\tau^- - \tilde{U}_\tau^-\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} d\tau \tag{4.8}$$

$$+ \int_0^t e^{-(m+\epsilon)(t-\tau)} \|U_\tau^+ - \tilde{U}_\tau^+\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} d\tau$$

$$+ \int_0^t e^{-(m+\epsilon)(t-\tau)} \|\tilde{U}_\tau^+\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left(\int_\tau^t e^{\epsilon s} \|U_s^- - \tilde{U}_s^-\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} ds \right) d\tau,$$

where $U_s^\pm := (a^\pm * u_s)$, $\tilde{U}_s^\pm := (a^\pm * \tilde{u}_s)$, and hence, for all $s \in [0, T]$, we have that

$$\max\{\|U_s^\pm\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}; \|\tilde{U}_s^\pm\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}\} \leq b\langle a^\pm \rangle.$$

We use this in (4.8) and obtain

$$\|F(u)_t - F(\tilde{u})_t\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq b \left[e^{-(m+\epsilon)t} + \frac{\langle a^+ \rangle}{m+\epsilon} \left(1 - e^{-(m+\epsilon)t} \right) \right]$$

$$\times \int_0^t e^{\epsilon\tau} \|U_\tau^- - \tilde{U}_\tau^-\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} d\tau + \frac{\langle a^+ \rangle}{m+\epsilon} \left(1 - e^{-(m+\epsilon)t} \right) \|u - \tilde{u}\|_T.$$

The latter estimate yields

$$\|F(u) - F(\tilde{u})\|_T \leq q(T) \|u - \tilde{u}\|_T,$$

$$q(T) := b\langle a^- \rangle \int_0^T e^{\epsilon s} ds + \left(1 - e^{-(m+\epsilon)T} \right),$$

where we have also taken into account that $\langle a^+ \rangle \leq m + \epsilon$ due to our choice of ϵ. Thus, for small enough T, F is a contraction, which yields that: (a) the equations in (4.6) and (4.7) are equivalent; (b) (4.7) has a unique solution, $u \in \mathcal{C}_T^+$, such that $\|u\|_T \leq b$. Now by means of (4.5) we return to the problem in (4.1) and obtain that it has a positive solution $\varrho_t \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $t > 0$ such that

$$\|\varrho_s\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \|\varrho_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \exp\left(-s(m - \langle a^+ \rangle) \right), \quad s \in [0, t]. \tag{4.9}$$

Indeed, for $v_s := e^{ms} \|\varrho_s\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ from (4.5) and (4.7) we get

$$v_t \leq v_0 + \langle a^+ \rangle \int_0^t v_s ds,$$

which by the Gronwall inequality yields (4.9). The proof is completed. □

4.2 Properties of the solution

In order to get additional tools for studying the solutions of (4.1), from now on we assume that the initial conditions are taken from the set $C_{\rm b}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of bounded continuous functions $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$. Then the solution ϱ_t will also belong to $C_{\rm b}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as this set is closed in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ whereas the map in right-hand side of (4.7) leaves it invariant. Thus, we can consider (4.1) in the Banach space obtained by equipping $C_{\rm b}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with the supremum norm. Note that also the map $\phi \to (a^\pm * \phi)$ leaves this spaces invariant – by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem this follows from the second equality in (4.2). By $\tilde{\Delta}$, $\tilde{\Delta}^+$, and $\tilde{\Delta}_b^+$ we denote the intersections of the corresponding sets defined in (4.4) with $C_{\rm b}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Our main task is to understand which properties of the model parameters, see (1.4) and (1.5), imply that the solution in question is globally bounded. If $m \geq \langle a^+ \rangle$ then $\|\varrho_t\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \|\varrho_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ for all $t > 0$, see (4.9). Thus, it is left to consider the case of $m < \langle a^+ \rangle$, in which ϱ_t has exponential grows in t if $a^- \equiv 0$.

The following alternative situations are studied separately, cf. (3.11):

$$\text{(i)} \qquad \exists \theta > 0 \quad a^+(x) \leq \theta a^-(x) \ \text{ for a.a. } x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{4.10}$$

$$\text{(ii)} \qquad \Upsilon_\theta := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \,:\, a^+(x) > \theta a^-(x) \right\} \text{ of positive meas.}$$

Theorem 4.3. *Let* (i) *in (4.10) hold. Then, for all $t > 0$, the solution of (4.1) with $\varrho_0 \in C_{\rm b}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ lies in $\tilde{\Delta}_b^+$ for some $b > 0$. Furthermore, if $\varrho_0 \in \tilde{\Delta}_{\theta-\delta}^+$, for some $\delta > 0$, then $\varrho_t \in \tilde{\Delta}_\theta^+$ for all $t > 0$.*

Remark 4.4. Theorem 3.4 establishes the existence of solution of (1.22) on a bounded time interval only. However, by Theorems 4.3 and 4.5 below, as well as by Lemma 4.1, the solution of (1.22) with $r_0 = e(\varrho_0, \cdot)$ can be extended to the whole $\mathbb{R}_+$ if the conditions of Theorems 4.3 or 4.5 are satisfied.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Suppose that the second part of the statement holds true. Then if ϱ_0 is not in $\tilde{\Delta}_{\theta-\delta}^+$, we can increase θ until this condition is satisfied. For this bigger value of θ, (i) in (4.10) clearly holds. Now let us prove the second part. Since the solution $\varrho_t(x)$ satisfies (4.9), we have

$$\|\varrho_s\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq (\theta - \delta) \exp\left(-s(m - \langle a^+ \rangle)\right), \quad s \in [0, t].$$

Hence, for small $t > 0$, $\varrho_t(x) < \theta$ for all x. Then either the latter holds for all $t > 0$, or there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $\varrho_{t_0}(x_0) = \theta$ for some x_0, and $\varrho_t(x)$ is strictly increasing on $[t_0, t_0 + \tau)$ for a small $\tau > 0$. Then

$$\left(\frac{d\varrho_{t_0}}{dt}\right)(x_0) = -m\theta - \left((\theta a^- - a^+) * \varrho_{t_0}\right)(x_0) < 0. \tag{4.11}$$

Thus, $\varrho_t(x_0)$ cannot increase at such a point. □

Now let us turn to case (ii) in (4.10). Define

$$f^\pm(\theta) = \int_{\Upsilon_\theta} a^\pm(x) dx, \qquad \theta > 0.$$

By (ii) both functions are positive and non-increasing, and

$$g(\theta) := f^+(\theta) - \theta f^-(\theta) > 0,$$

for all $\theta > 0$. Hence, $f^-(\theta) < f^+(\theta)/\theta$.

Theorem 4.5. *Assume that there exists $\theta > 0$ such that $g(\theta) < m$. Then the solution of (4.1) with $\varrho_0 \in \tilde{\Delta}^+_{\theta-\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$, lies in $\tilde{\Delta}^+_\theta$ for all $t > 0$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\|\varrho_{t'}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} > \theta$, for some $t' > 0$. Then, since $\|\varrho_t\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ is continuous in t, one can choose small enough $\varepsilon > 0$ with $\varepsilon < (m - g(\theta))/g(\theta)$ such that the set $A_\varepsilon := \{t > 0 : \|\varrho_t\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \theta + \varepsilon\}$ is nonempty. Since $\|\varrho_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \theta$ and by the continuity arguments, one has $s := \inf A_\varepsilon > 0$ and $s \in A_\varepsilon$. Moreover,

$$\|\varrho_t\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \theta + \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, s) \tag{4.12}$$

(note that if $\|\varrho_{t_1}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} > \theta + \varepsilon$, for some $t_1 \in (0, s)$, then there exists $t_2 \in (0, t_1) \subset (0, s)$ with $\|\varrho_{t_2}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \theta + \varepsilon$ that contradicts the choice of s).

Since $\|\varrho_s\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \theta + \varepsilon$, there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\varrho_s(x) \in (\theta, \theta + \varepsilon]$. For this x, $\varrho_0(x) < \theta$, therefore, the set $B_{s,x} := \{t \in (0, s) : \varrho_t(x) = \theta\}$ is nonempty. By the continuity of $\varrho_t(x)$ in t, we have $\tau := \sup B_{s,x} \in (0, s)$ and $\tau \in B_{s,x}$. Moreover, by a similar argument to that mentioned above,

$$\varrho_t(x) > \theta, \quad \text{for all } t \in (\tau, s). \tag{4.13}$$

Combining (4.12) and (4.13), we get, for any $t \in (\tau, s)$ and for the chosen x,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{d\varrho_t}{dt}\right)(x) &< -m\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[a^+(y) - \theta a^-(y)\right] \varrho_t(x - y)dy \\
&< -m\theta + (\theta + \varepsilon) \int_{\Upsilon_\theta} \left[a^+(y) - \theta a^-(y)\right] dy \\
&= \theta[-m + g(\theta)] + \varepsilon g(\theta) < 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by the choice of ε maid above. Therefore, the function $\varrho_t(x)$ is decreasing in t on (τ, s), hence, for all $t \in (\tau, s)$, $\varrho_t(x) < \varrho_\tau(x) = \theta$ that contradicts (4.13). The contradiction shows that $\|\varrho_t\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \le \theta$, for all $t > 0$, that proves the statement. □

The condition crucial for the proof of Theorem 4.5 is that $g(\theta) < m$ for θ such that $\varrho_0 \in \tilde{\Delta}^+_{\theta-\delta}$. If a^- has finite range, this holds under condition (4.14) since

$$\lim_{\theta \to +\infty} g(\theta) = \int_{\Upsilon_\infty} a^+(x)dx, \quad \Upsilon_\infty := \bigcap_{\theta > 0} \Upsilon_\theta = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : a^-(x) = 0\}.$$

Then, the solution ϱ_t is globally bounded if

$$\int_{\Upsilon_\infty} a^+(x)dx < m, \tag{4.14}$$

which points to the role of the competition in the considered model – if $a^- \equiv 0$, then the left-hand side of (4.14) is just $\langle a^+ \rangle$ and the condition in (4.14) turns into that of the sub-criticality in the contact model. [18] To illustrate this conclusion, let us consider the following example. For $r > 0$, set $B_r = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| \leq r\}$, and let $\mathbb{I}_r$ and $|B_r|$ stand for the indicator and the Euclidean volume of B_r, respectively. For

$$a^+ = \alpha \mathbb{I}_R, \quad a^- = \beta \mathbb{I}_r, \qquad R > r > 0, \quad \alpha, \beta > 0, \tag{4.15}$$

we have

$$g(\theta) = \begin{cases} \alpha |B_R| - \theta \beta |B_r|, & \text{if } \ \theta < \alpha/\beta; \\ \alpha(|B_R| - |B_r|), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Hence, the condition of Theorem 4.5 is satisfied if

$$\alpha(|B_R| - |B_r|) < m. \tag{4.16}$$

Case (ii) of (4.10) contains a subcase where one can get more than the mere global boundedness established in Theorem 4.5. From (4.7) it clearly follows that the solution as in Theorem 4.2 is independent of x, i.e., is translation invariant, if so is ϱ_0. This translation invariant solution can be obtained explicitly. By setting $\varrho_t(x) \equiv \psi_t$ we obtain from (4.1) the following

$$\frac{d}{dt}\psi_t = (\langle a^+ \rangle - m)\psi_t - \langle a^- \rangle \psi_t^2, \qquad \psi_t|_{t=0} = \psi_0, \tag{4.17}$$

which is a Bernoulli equation. For $m > \langle a^+ \rangle$, its solution decays to zero exponentially as $t \to +\infty$. For $m = \langle a^+ \rangle$, the solution is $\psi_t = \psi_0/(1 + \langle a^- \rangle \psi_0 t)$, and hence also decays to zero as $t \to +\infty$. For $m < \langle a^+ \rangle$, we set

$$q = \frac{\langle a^+ \rangle - m}{\langle a^- \rangle}. \tag{4.18}$$

In this case the solution of (4.17) has the form

$$\psi_t = \frac{\psi_0 q}{\psi_0 + (q - \psi_0)\exp(-q\langle a^- \rangle t)}, \tag{4.19}$$

which, in particular, means that $\psi_t \to q$ as $t \to +\infty$. Note that $\psi_t = q$ for all $t > 0$ whenever $\psi_0 = q$.

Theorem 4.6. *Suppose that $q > 0$ and there exists $\varkappa^+ > q$ such that $a^+(x) \geq \varkappa^+ a^-(x)$ for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let also the initial condition $\varrho_0 \in C_{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ in (4.1) obey*

$$0 < \varkappa^- < \varrho_0(x) < \varkappa^+ < +\infty, \tag{4.20}$$

for some $\varkappa^- \in (0, q)$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t > 0$, the solution as in Theorem 4.2 obeys the bounds $\psi_t^- < \varrho_t(x) < \psi_t^+$, where $\psi_t^\pm$ are given in (4.19) with $\psi_0 = \varkappa^\pm$. Hence $\varrho_t(x) \to q$ in $C_{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as $t \to +\infty$.

The condition in Theorem 4.6 can be formulated as $\Upsilon_\theta = \mathbb{R}^d$ for all $\theta < q$. Its another form is

$$\frac{a^+(x)}{\langle a^+\rangle} \geq \left(1 - \frac{m}{\langle a^+\rangle}\right) \frac{a^-(x)}{\langle a^-\rangle}, \tag{4.21}$$

from which we see that the scale of the competition is irrelevant for the result stated in Theorem 4.6 to hold. If $a^+(x) = \theta a^-(x)$, for some $\theta > 0$ and almost all x, then (4.21) holds for all $m \in [0, \langle a^+\rangle)$. If the competition has the range shorter than that of dispersal, the mentioned homogenization occurs at nonzero mortality m. For the example from (4.15), condition (4.21) holds if

$$1 - \frac{m}{\langle a_+\rangle} \leq \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^d,$$

which is exactly the one given in (4.16).

Proof of Theorem 4.6. As $\psi_t^- < \varrho_t(x) < \psi_t^+$ clearly holds for $t = 0$, by the continuity of the three functions of t it holds for $t \in (0, \tau)$, for some $\tau > 0$. Write

$$\frac{d}{dt}\varrho_t(x) = -m\varrho_t(x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a_t(x,y)\varrho_t(y)dy$$

$$a_t(x,y) := a^+(x-y) - \varrho_t(x)a^-(x-y).$$

By the assumption $\varrho_t(x) < \psi_t^+ < \varkappa^+$, $t \in (0,\tau)$, and hence a_t is a positive kernel. Also $\varrho_t(x) > \psi_t^-$, $t \in (0,\tau)$, which yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}\varrho_t(x) \geq -m\varrho_t(x) - \langle a^-\rangle\psi_t^-\,\varrho_t(x) + \langle a^+\rangle\psi_t^-.$$

Introduce $u_t(x) := \varrho_t(x) - \psi_t^-$ and obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}u_t(x) \geq -mu_t(x) - \langle a^-\rangle\psi_t^- u_t(x)$$

$$= -(m + \langle a^-\rangle q)u_t(x) + \langle a^-\rangle(q - \psi_t^-)u_t(x) \geq -\langle a^+\rangle u_t(x),$$

where we have taken into account that $\psi_t^- < q$ for all $t > 0$. The latter yields

$$\varrho_t(x) - \psi_t^- \geq (\varrho_0(x) - \varkappa)\exp(-t\langle a^+\rangle), \qquad t \in (0,\tau).$$

Hence, the estimate $\varrho_t(x) - \psi_t^- > 0$ can be continued to arbitrary value of t by repeating the above arguments with the same τ. In a similar way, we obtain

$$\psi_t^+ - \varrho_t(x) \geq (\psi_0^+ - \varrho_0(x))\exp(-t[m + \langle a\rangle\theta]),$$

which completes the proof. □

4.3 Conclusion remarks

The microscopic dynamics of the model considered here were first studied in [13], where weak* solutions of the problem in (1.11) were shown to exist on $[0, +\infty)$ under the condition which in our notations is (3.11) plus also $m > 16\theta\langle a^- \rangle + 4\langle a^+ \rangle$, see Theorems 4.6 and 5.1 on pages 309, 310. Afterwards, the results of [13] were used in [10] to derive and resume studying of the kinetic equation in (1.23).

An analog of (4.1) was non-rigorously deduced in [8] from a microscopic model on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Then this equation with $a^+ = a^-$ was studied in [24]. The case of equal kernels is covered by both Theorems 4.3 and 4.6. According to Theorem 4.2, with no assumption on the parameters of the model we have the existence of the global evolution of ϱ_t, which is in accord with Theorem 3.4. A possible interpretation is that the mesoscopic description based on the scaling applied here is insensitive to the relationship between a^+ and a^-. This relationship is important if one wants to get more detailed information, which is contained in Theorems 4.3 and 4.6.

Acknowledgement This work was financially supported by the DFG through SFB 701: "Spektrale Strukturen und Topologische Methoden in der Mathematik" and by the European Commission under the project STREVCOMS PIRSES-2013-612669. The support from the ZiF Research Group "Stochastic Dynamics: Mathematical Theory and Applications" (Universität Bielefeld) was also very helpful.

References

[1] N. Bellomo, D. Knopoff, and J. Soler, On the difficult interplay between life, "complexity", and mathematical sciences, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **23** (2013) 1861–1913.

[2] Ch. Berns, Yu. Kondratiev, Yu. Kozitsky, and O. Kutoviy, Kawasaki dynamics in continuum: micro- and mesoscopic descriptions, *J. Dyn. Diff. Equat.* **25** (2013) 1027–1056.

[3] N. N. Bogoliubov, Problemy dinamičeskoi teorii v statističeskoi fizike (Russian) [Problems of Dynamical Theory in Statistical Physics], Gosudarstv. Izdat. Tehn.–Teor. Lit., Moscow-Leningrad, 1946.

[4] B. M. Bolker and S. W. Pacala, Using moment equations to understand stochastically driven spatial pattern formation in ecological systems, *Theoret. Population Biol.* **52** (1997) 179–197.

[5] B. M. Bolker, S. W. Pacala, and C. Neuhauser, Spatial dynamics in model plant communities: What do we really know? *The American Naturalist* **162** (2003) 135–148.

[6] U. Dieckmann and R. Law, Relaxation projections and the method of moments, *The Geometry of Ecological Interactions,* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000), pp. 412–455.

[7] R. L. Dobrushin, Y. G. Sinai, and Y. M. Sukhov, Dynamical systems of statistical mechanics, *Itogi Nauki,* (VINITI, 1985), pp. 235–284; eng. transl. *Ergodic Theory with Applications to Dynamical Systems and Statistical Mechanics, II* ed. Ya. G. Sinai, (Encyclopaedia Math. Sci., Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, 1989).

[8] R. Durrett, Crabgrass, measles, and gypsy moths: an introduction to modern probability, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* **18** (1988) 117–143

[9] D. Finkelshtein, Y. Kondratiev and Y. Kozitsky, Glauber dynamics in continuum: a constructive approach to evolution of states, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **33** (2013) 1431–1450.

[10] D. Finkelshtein, Y. Kondratiev and O. Kutoviy, An operator approach to Vlasov scaling for some models of spatial ecology, *Methods Funct. Anal. Topology* **19** (2013) 108–126.

[11] D. Finkelshtein, Y. Kondratiev and O. Kutoviy, Semigroup approach to birth-and-death stochastic dynamics in continuum, *J. Funct. Anal.* **262** (2012) 1274–1308.

[12] D. L. Finkelshtein, Yu. G. Kondratiev, and O. Kutoviy, Vlasov scaling for stochastic dynamics of continuous systems, *J. Statist. Phys.* **141** (2010) 158–178.

[13] D. L. Finkelshtein, Yu. G. Kondratiev, and O. Kutoviy, Individual based model with competition in spatial ecology, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **41** (2009) 297–317.

[14] D. L. Finkelshtein, Yu. G. Kondratiev, and M. J. Oliveira, Markov evolution and hierarchical equations in the continuum. I: One-component systems, *J. Evol. Equ.* **9** (2009) 197–233.

[15] N. Fournier and S. Méléard, A microscopic probabilistic description of a locally regulated population and macroscopic approximations, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **14** (2004) 1880–1919.

[16] T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators.* (Second edition. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 132. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1976).

[17] Yu. Kondratiev and T. Kuna, Harmonic analysis on configuration space. I. General theory, *Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top.* **5** (2002) 201–233.

[18] Yu. Kondratiev, O. Kutoviy, and S. Pirogov, Correlation functions and invariant measures in continuous contact model, *Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top.* **11** (2008) 231–258.

[19] D. J. Murrell, U. Dieckmann, and R. Law, On moment closures for population dynamics in continuous space, *J. Theoret. Biol.* **229** (2004) 421–432.

[20] C. Neuhauser, Mathematical challenges in spatial ecology, *Notices of AMS* **48** (11) (2001) 1304–1314.

[21] N. Obata, Configuration space and unitary representations of the group of diffeomorphisms, *RIMS Kôkyûroku* **615** (1987) 129–153.

[22] O. Ovaskainen, D. Finkelshtein, O.Kutoviy, S, Cornell, B. Bolker, and Yu. Kondratiev, A general mathematical framework for the analysis of spatio-temporal point processes, *Theoretical Ecology* **7** (2014) 101–113.

[23] A. Pazy, *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Applications to Partial Differential Equations,* Applied Mathematical Sciences, 44. (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983).

[24] B. Perthame and P. E. Souganidis, Front propagation for a jump process model arising in spatial ecology, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **13** (2005) 1235–1246.

[25] E. Presutti, *Scaling Limits in Statistical Mechanics and Microstructures in Continuum Mechanics,* (Theoretical and Mathematical Physics. Springer, Berlin. 2009.)

[26] H. R. Thieme and J. Voigt, Stochastic semigroups: their construction by perturbation and approximation, *Positivity IV—Theory and Applications,* eds. M. R. Weber and J. Voigt (Tech. Univ. Dresden, Dresden, 2006), pp. 135–146.

[27] F. Trèves, *Ovcyannikov Theorem and Hyperdifferential Operators,* Notas de Matemática, No. 46 (Instituto de Matem'atica Pura e Aplicada, Conselho Nacional de Pesquisas, Rio de Janeiro, 1968).

[28] Xiao-Qiang Zhao, *Dynamical Systems in Population Biology.* (CMS Books in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York Inc., 2003).